UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,403	07/27/2001	Srinivas Gutta	US010351	7749

24737 7590 07/09/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
REKSTAD, ERICK J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	6

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/916,403	GUTTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Erick Rekstad	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 July 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2 and 5*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first action for application no. 09/916,403 filed on July 27, 2001 in which claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "optical devices" in claim 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 1, 6 an 7 do not describe the limitation of multiple optical devices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim 1-4, 6, 15, 16 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,741,165 to Langfahl et al.

[claim 1]

As shown in Figure 3, Langfahl teaches a system for detecting and recording an image of an impact to an object, the system comprising:

a) a sensor (321 and 322) located to detect an impact at a corresponding surface region of the object and provide an output in response detection of such an impact and

b) an optical device (310) having a field of view, the space adjacent the surface region corresponding to the sensor located within the field of view of the optical device, wherein the output provided by the sensor in response to detection of an impact initiates image capture by the optical device of the space adjacent the surface region corresponding to the sensor (Col 3 Line 53- Col 4 Line 15, Fig. 3 and 5).

[claims 2 and 3]

As shown in Figure 3, the detection system is on a vehicle (300) as required by claim 2. Langfahl further teaches the use of a CCD imaging device as required by claim 3 (Col 2 Lines 23-50).

[claim 4]

As shown in Figure 3, Langfahl teaches a control unit (312) that receives the output provided by the sensor in response to detection of an impact, wherein the control

unit, upon receipt of the output provided by the sensor when an impact is detected initiates image capture by the optical device (Col 3 Lines 59-65, Fig. 3).

[claim 6]

As shown in Figure 3, Langfahl teaches a plurality of sensors (321 and 322) each located to detect an impact at a corresponding surface region of the object and provide an output in response to detection of such an impact (Col 3 Line 53- Col 4 Line 15, Fig. 3 and 5).

[claim 15]

Langfahl teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the optical device is movable to position the field of view of the optical device so that the space adjacent the surface region corresponding to the sensor is located within the field of view of the optical device (Col 3 Lines 14-29, Fig. 3).

[claim 16]

As shown in Figure 5, Langfahl teaches the method of detecting an impact to an object at an impact region, comprising the steps of:

a) detecting an impact to an object (501)

b) generating an output signal in response to the detection of the impact (507)

c) initiating an image capture of the impact to the object in response to generation of the output signal of step b, the image capture being by an optical device having a field of view that includes the impact region (509, 511, 519) (Col 5 Lines 33-59, Fig. 5).

[claim 18]

Langfahl teaches the sending of the images to an image receiving device (344, Fig. 3) for viewing (Col 5 Lines 19-24, Fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanfahl in view of US Patent 5,408,214 to Chalmers et al.

[claim 5]

Lanfahl teaches the system of claim 1, Lanfahl does not teach a specific type of impact sensor. Calmers teaches an electrical impact sensor for sensing contact with an obstacle anywhere along a relatively large sensing zone without being limited to the relatively small sensing zones provided by the sensing probes of the prior art (Abstract, Col 2 Lines 51-64, Col 3 Lines 18-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the impact sensor of Calmers in the system of Lanfahl in order to provide a sensor that can sense contact anywhere along a relatively large sensing zone.

Claims 7-10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanfahl in view of US Patent 6,630,884 to Shanmugham.

[claims 7-10]

Lanfahl teaches the system of claims 1 and 6. As shown in Figure 3, the detection system is on a vehicle (300) as required by claim 9. Langfahl further teaches the use of a CCD imaging device as required by claim 8 (Col 2 Lines 23-50). As shown in Figure 3, Langfahl teaches a control unit (312) that receives the output provided by the sensor in response to detection of an impact, wherein the control unit, upon receipt of the output provided by the sensor when an impact is detected initiates image capture by the optical device as required by claim 10 (Col 3 Lines 59-65, Fig. 3). Lanfahl further teaches producing a 360 sweep when a motion sensor is triggered, air bag is deployed or as a failsafe (Col 3 Lines 44-50, Col 5 Lines 62-65, Fig. 5). Lanfahl does not teach performing a 360 sweep when an impact sensor is triggered. Shanmugham teaches the capture of a panoramic image when an impact sensor is triggered in order to provide a more detailed account of the events before and after a car accident (Col 2 Lines 35-37, Col 3 Lines 47-65, Col 4 Lines 12-18, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Lanfahl with the recording system of Shanmugham in order to provide a more detailed account of the events before and after a car accident.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanfahl in view of US Patent 6,246,933 to Bague.

[claims 11-14 and 17]

Lanfahl teaches the system of claims 1 and 6 and method claim 16 as shown above. Lanfahl further teaches the use of a camera as an optical device and the system being used for an automobile, as shown above for the rejection of claims 2 and

3. Lanfahl further teaches a control unit for adjusting a single optical device to capture an image of the region of the triggered impact sensor, as shown above for the rejection of claim 4. Lanfahl does not teach the use of multiple optical devices.

Bague teaches the use of multiple video cameras (13 and 15 in Figure 1) in order to capture an accident in more detail for improved analyzes (Col 15 Lines 13-22, Lines 51-62, Fig. 1). Bague further teaches a control unit for receiving and storing images from one or more video cameras (Col 16 Lines 7-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the single camera of Lanfahl with the multiple cameras of Bague in order to capture an accident in more detail for improved analyzes.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 5,680,123 to Lee.

US Patent 4,281,354 to Conte.

US Patent 6,389,340 to Rayner.

US Patent 6,570,609 to Heien.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erick Rekstad whose telephone number is 703-305-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 703-305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erick Rekstad
Examiner
AU 2613
(703) 305-5543
erick.rekstad@uspto.gov

GIMS PHILIPPE
PRIMARY EXAMINER